



# Single Family Zoning and Tree Regulations



*Follow-up  
Community  
Workshop*

December 7, 2015

# Agenda

1. Welcome and Introduction
2. Brief Overview of Proposed Updates to Regulations
3. Objectives for This Second Workshop
4. Emerging Consensus Points; Follow-up Questions
5. Breakout: Small-table Discussions
6. Reporting Out
7. Next Steps



## What Regulations are being updated?

- Floor Area/Building Setback Standards
- Residential Parking Regulations
- Tree Removal
- Secondary Dwelling Units
- Single Family Residential Design Review Process



## Why modify these Regulations?

- Need to correct problems and better meet needs of community – Council priority!
- Current regulations are cumbersome and overly restrictive; they also do not address impacts on the neighborhood.
- Review criteria are subjective – no clear rules
- Tree Ordinance is too broad & expensive to comply with; also promotes non-native invasive trees



## City Goals for Updates

- Establish a fair, objective, and predictable process
- Expand oversight of projects and ensure adequate design and technical review, with citizen input
- Facilitate improvements to aging housing stock to meet the needs of growing families who want to stay here
- Ensure homes have sufficient parking
- Comply with mandatory State requirements (2<sup>nd</sup> units)
- Establish standards for review of tree permits and provide greater protection for healthy, native trees



## Key Points: Single Family House Size

- Maximum of 5,000 square feet with a sliding scale incorporating lot size/ slope to reduce the maximum.
- Add more flexibility for unusual cases.
- Need neighbor input if significant impacts could occur.
- Use daylight plane and building envelope plane; consider topography and architectural design.
- Don't count garage space in floor area.
- Setbacks also should be used to address this issue.



## Key Points: House Design and “Fit”

- Yes for setbacks and nonconforming provisions, but nonconforming additions only towards the back: OK as following line of house but not OK for second story.
- Some didn't like decks & porches projecting into yards.
- No flexibility for going up in nonconforming situations.
- Respond to desire that homes fit in their neighborhoods. Upper-story setbacks are key.
- Concerns about enforcement of design and overregulation.



## Key Points: Parking - 1

- Most wanted garages for new homes.
- Many OK with carports for existing homes; others were against this proposal.
- Emerging consensus: need to provide exceptions for older homes with one car garage.
- Same size garages are unreasonable; City should base rule on home size; 20' x 20' requirement is too large for smaller homes and in some areas.





## Key Points: Parking - 2

- Do not penalize owners for adding rooms; instead:
  - Use average number of cars people own as opposed to number of bedrooms; and
  - Base rule on square footage of house and/or lot size.
- Count all legal parking spaces – covered or uncovered.
- Second units should trigger more parking on-site.



## Key Points: Trees -1

- Rules should treat maintenance and development the same (new construction resulting in a loss of a tree).
- Allow removal of diseased trees; don't charge at all.
- Allow thinning of interior trees, not visible from street.
- Protect native, healthy trees and large trees at 24" DBH; don't limit to heritage trees only.
- Simpler ordinance; allow 1:1 replacement.
- People should engage neighbors if a tree that crosses lot lines needs to be removed (mediation concept)



## Key Points: Trees - 2

- Make rules more straight-forward, with more reasonable fees.
- Provide greater protection for native trees, healthy trees, and large trees throughout the City.
- Are there additional changes that should be considered?



## Key Points: Second Units

- Some OK with reduction to 1,000 sq. ft.; others prefer 640 or 670 sq. ft. maximum or base on lot size.
- If a second unit is added within existing envelope, it shouldn't matter – no limit on square footage should be set for these units.
- Size of unit: index according to FAR; no maximum size.
- CUP for units on lots less than 5,000 sq. ft.
- Don't need to reduce max; no cap.



## Key Points: Design Review Process

- General support for the proposed “tiered approach” with neighborhood notification and the Planning Commission retaining jurisdiction over larger projects.
  - Possible refinements to account for lot size or location within the community.
- Need more predictability; the approval process shouldn't take so long.
- Some advocated abolishing design review and to hold people to specific understandable standards.



## Ground Rules for Small Groups

- Speak one at a time
- Listen for understanding
- Suspend snap judgments
- Stay on the timeline, keep comments concise, avoid repetition – We have 60 minutes (10 per question)
- Each member of the group is equal, all comments matter – One person reports out – 45 minutes for this

**PARTICIPATE!**

